



**Municipal Property
Comprehensive Consolidation Plan**

Somerville, Massachusetts

April, 2007

HMFH Architects, Inc.

130 Bishop Allen Drive

Cambridge, MA 02139

t 617 492 2200

f 617 876 9775

www.hmfh.com





Table of Contents

Acknowledgement

1. Executive Summary

2. Introduction

- Challenge
- Objectives
- Scope
- Process

3. Program Comprehension: establish the needs

4. Property Analysis: define the assets

- Description
- Evaluation
- Renovation Scope
- Renovation Comparison
- Property Comparison

5. Preliminary Options

6. Options 1, 2, and 3

7. Conclusion

Acknowledgement

Municipal Property Review Committee

Thomas Bent, Chair
Arthur “Trey” Agnew
Charles McKenzie
John Roberto

Joseph Curtatone, Mayor, City of Somerville
Edward Bean, Chief Financial Officer
Gerald Boyle, Director, Capital Projects
Richard Brescia, Chief Assessor
Janice Delory, Chief of Staff, Mayor’s Office
Alice Martin, Senior Planner, Mayor’s Office of Strategic Planning & Community
Development
Anthony Pierantozzi, Superintendent of Schools

Architects/Planners: HMFH Architects, Inc.

George Metzger, AIA, Principal in Charge
Lori Cowles, AIA, LEED AP, Project Manager

Cost Consultants: Project Management & Cost, Inc.

Peter Bradley

1. Executive Summary

HMFH Architects, Inc. began working with the Mayor's Office of Strategic Planning & Community Development (SPCD) and the Mayor's Municipal Property Review Committee (MPRC) in September 2006. The challenge put forth was to provide the SPCD and MPRC, the Mayor and the City of Somerville with a comprehensive consolidation plan for municipal properties. This report details the findings of the initial task that provide the groundwork for further development of a single consolidation plan.

The scope of this study involved review of existing documentation and properties, workshops and meetings with the SPCD, MPRC, City Assessor, maintenance staff, and building inspector, and evaluation of existing properties, including renovation and upgrades required. Each of the properties was visited and assessed. Ten city-owned properties are included in the consolidation options developed in this report.

The SPCD provided the space requirements for all municipal services included in the study. The consolidation program is 140,550 GSF and includes offices for the executive branch, the school administration, the health department, etc., as well as space for seniors programs, youth programs and school-related programs. The complete program is included in Section 3 of this report.

Once the consolidation program was established and the city-owned properties were identified and assessed, it became immediately clear that the property assets (365,682 GSF) greatly exceeded the program needs (140,550 GSF) by nearly 150%. While it is a positive thing for a city to have assets, it can also be a costly endeavor to maintain too much property that is inefficiently used. This is the rationale for the consolidation options developed during this study.

The property analysis portion of the study involved an understanding of each property, how it currently functions, and an evaluation of its current condition and its potential future use. The renovation scope needed for each property was assessed and budgetary costs for renovations were developed. Section 4 of this report contains the property assessment.

The SPCD and the City's Assessors provided property values, disposition values and current annual utility costs for each property. These values, along with the renovation budget estimates developed by the study team, provided the basis for comparison and assessment of the different consolidation options.

Following several preliminary consolidation models, the options developed identified three approaches:

- Consolidate to centralize municipal services
- Consolidate to divest the property(ies) with the highest disposition value and highest renovation cost
- Consolidate conservatively at present to provide flexibility for the city's future growth

Option 1 enables the city to retain properties to centralize municipal services. The three centrally located properties retained and developed are City Hall, Cummings School and Homans property. Much of the municipal departments and programs would be consolidated on the Homans property in a newly constructed building. The property is

adjacent to a future MBTA Green Line stop that will both energize the neighborhood and provide ease of public access to the municipal offices.

When fully implemented, Option 1 meets the evaluation criteria set forth in this study. It is rational and achievable, improves customer service, upgrades and/or eliminates excess building stock, and provides operational cost savings through consolidation. Future expansion of programs and departments is allotted in the new development at the Homans property. The retained properties meet a level of appropriateness for their proposed use within the following areas: the buildings have civic character, the locations have parking and public transportation, the programs would aptly fit within the buildings and the neighborhood impact would be either negligible or an improvement.

Option 2 enables the city to divest the two properties that have both the highest disposition value and renovation costs: Homans Building and Powder House Community School. Once these properties are sold, the largest city owned property remaining is Edgerly School. Consolidation of municipal offices and programs into a renovated Edgerly would save on development costs but would likely not create as successful an outcome as the other options proposed in this study.

When fully implemented, Option 2 meets the evaluation criteria set forth in this study, as noted previously for Option 1. The reuse of Edgerly School as proposed in Option 2 is likely to place a burden on the Edgerly neighborhood, due both to parking requirements and to the high volume of visitors to the residential area. While Option 2 attains the appropriateness levels with regard to civic character and public transportation, at the Edgerly property the impact on the neighborhood, the lack of available parking and the as yet untested program fit within the 1920's school building all may hinder the success of this option.

Option 3 enables the city to part with under performing, inefficiently used, and surplus properties in the immediate or intermediate term, while centralizing some services and retaining other properties to allow for flexible future consolidation. The immediate sale of under performing properties (Powder House Community School and Recreation) and subsequent sale of 92 Union Square (SCAT) will provide revenue and annual savings to the city sooner, while retaining other properties for flexible phasing of future consolidation.

Option 3 is rational and achievable, improves customer service, upgrades and/or eliminates excess building stock, and provides operational cost savings through consolidation. Future expansion of programs and departments is allotted in any new development, whether at Homans, in Union Square or elsewhere. The retained and developed properties would meet the level of appropriateness for civic use set forth in this study.

The three options outlined above and developed in this initial phase of the consolidation plan provide a starting point for a more detailed plan to achieve a realistic and cost effective consolidation.

2. Introduction

Challenge

The City of Somerville's municipal departments and services are distributed throughout the city. Twelve separate and distinct, city-owned properties are the focus of this study. The properties are in varying state of use, physical condition and appropriateness. Appropriateness is defined as meeting the needs of the intended program in a facility that provides the necessary parking and access to public transportation, generates favorable neighborhood impact and fits the program needs well, in a building of suitable municipal character.

Previous studies and committees have looked at possible consolidation scenarios that focused primarily on relocating the majority of municipal programs to a single location. While this approach may have benefits with regard to one-stop shopping for services, it generates other unfavorable conditions that are not easily overcome. For example, a single large renovation project causes an upfront financial burden for the city and centralizing services all on one property may have an adverse impact on the neighborhood.

The challenge of this comprehensive consolidation plan is to develop a consolidation plan that is rational and achievable, in close collaboration with the Mayor's Office of Strategic Planning & Community Development (SPCD), and under the advisement of the Mayor's Municipal Property Review Committee (MPRC) and the School Department.

Objectives

The study objectives of the comprehensive consolidation plan are to allow the city to address the following needs:

- a rational and achievable plan for consolidating municipal uses
- the highest and best use of city-owned properties
- improvements to customer services
- a plan for upgrading or elimination of existing under utilized building stock
- operational cost savings due to consolidation and upgrades to buildings
- long range plan for potential future needs and growth
- new revenue opportunities from property disposition to offset costs of the consolidation

Scope

The initial phase of the study involved:

- Review of existing documentation
- Visits to municipal properties
- Workshops with maintenance staff, city assessor, and SPCD
- Meeting with Inspectional Services
- Evaluation of existing properties
- Assessment of highest and best use of municipal properties
- Identifying renovation/upgrades of properties required for municipal use
- Development of consolidation scenarios
- Development of comparative cost models for consolidation

The municipal properties or services not included in this consolidation plan are:

- Libraries
- Active schools
- Police stations*
- Fire stations*
- Department of Public Works**

Additionally, the Retirement Board offices, currently located in the City Hall Annex, are not part of this study. If and when the Annex offices are to be relocated, the Retirement Board as a separate, independent entity, will find other accommodations.

*The Police Headquarters, Engine No. 3 and Fire Prevention and Safety occupy the Public Safety Building at 228 Washington Street. In its present condition, half of the lower level of the building is not used due to water infiltration and poor indoor air quality. As a result the fire station and Fire Prevention and Safety currently are housed on-site in temporary trailers. The building is situated on a strategic 1.87-acre site adjacent to Union Square.

For the following reasons the Public Safety Building property and its programs were not incorporated in this consolidation plan:

- the specialized space requirements of public safety functions,
- the particular site and location needs of these programs within the city,
- and the separate funding opportunities for these programs.

**The Department of Public Works (DPW) located at 1 Franey Road was also not incorporated in the consolidation plan. The large parcel is nearly six acres and the building and its storage garages are particular to the programs it serves. The DPW requires a considerable amount of land for its various storage and operational functions that would not easily relocate to any of the other properties included in this consolidation study. While the DPW property is not within the study scope, the programs currently at the DPW were reviewed to assess their appropriateness at this location.

The DPW and Public Safety Building programs and square footage are as follows:

No.	DEPARTMENT	Includes:	Current Location	GSF*
6	DEPART. OF PUBLIC WORKS		DPW	8,000
		Health Inspectors	DPW	1,350
		Inspectional Services	DPW	3,500
		Animal Control	DPW	500
9	FIRE DEPARTMENT	Fire Prevention/Safety	Public Safety Bldg	2,800
		Fire Station Engine Co. 3	Public Safety Bldg	9,000
15	POLICE DEPARTMENT		Public Safety Bldg	46,000

* Source: The Office of Strategic Planning & Development
= requires public access

Total 71,150

The ten properties included in this consolidation plan are:

- City Hall Annex, 50 Evergreen Avenue
- Edgerly School, 33 Cross Street
- Recreation Building, 19 Walnut Street
- Homans Building, 350 Medford Street
- Cummings School, 93 School Street
- 92 Union Square (SCAT)
- Powder House Community School, 1060 Broadway
- City Hall, 93 Highland Avenue
- Traffic & Parking, 133 Holland Street
- Youth and Senior Center, 165 Broadway

Process

The study team began by reviewing two distinct previous studies. In April 2003, the Office of Housing & Community Development conducted the *Homans Building Space Planning Study*. Homans Building, is a three-story, 1925 warehouse building with three adjoining garages. It is located at 350 Medford Street and is currently unoccupied. The 2003 *Study* proposed renovation of Homans to accommodate twelve city departments, and assessed Homans as “structurally sound, but will need all new systems and should have new exterior walls...”.

In March 2004, the *Municipal Property Review Committee (MPRC) Report* reviewed the 2003 *Study* and proposed use of the Powder House Community School for consolidation of municipal offices. In the 2004 *MPRC Report*, Homans Building was determined to be too small to accommodate the proposed city departments, to have insufficient parking, and to require a very high cost of renovation. The *MPRC Report* did agree with the 2003 *Study* in that “consolidation of departmental space in the City is sound policy and makes good sense.”

The 2004 *MPRC Report* proceeded to evaluate nine city-owned properties. The *Report* recommends that seven of the nine properties be disposed of, leaving the Traffic & Parking building in its current use and the Powder House Community School to be considered for renovation for consolidation of city departments. Powder House is a much larger building, at approximately 100,000 square feet, than the Homans Building, and is assessed to be in better physical condition. Parking availability and its proximity to public transportation made Powder House a viable option for consolidation.

In 2006, a new Municipal Property Review Committee was formed. The MPRC revisited its recommendation to renovate Powder House for municipal offices due to the “escalating construction costs and an in-depth examination of the building’s structure” that led to a construction cost estimate increase from approximately \$6 million to upwards of \$14 million. The limitations to the City’s bonding capacity that resulted from increases to the Argenziano School project made it extremely difficult to fund added costs of these proportions for the Powder House project. The MPRC proposed further study, with HMFH Architects, “to determine which scenario best fits the needs of the city in the short and long term.”

The Mayor’s Office of Strategic Planning and Community Development (SPCD) generated a Needs Assessment spreadsheet to determine the gross square feet of program space required for municipal offices. SPCD interviewed the relevant departments, and based on staff numbers and department needs (conference space, storage, classroom, work room, etc.), created a matrix of square footage needs using industry standards for various types of office space. Further analysis was developed to understand where and how the programs are currently housed and the interrelationship of the many city departments.

The ten municipal properties were toured and individuals working at each building and DPW staff were consulted to obtain an overall understanding of the buildings’ physical condition, appropriateness of current use, and site/neighborhood compatibility. Through this review and analysis the study team was able to establish a comprehensive understanding of the properties and how they relate to the city’s program needs.

Other resources included the City Assessor’s database, current utility costs and SPCD’s development of disposition values for each of the properties. For ease of comparison, the property values were represented on a per square foot basis.

Once the needs (actual or proposed program areas) and the assets (the values and conditions of the properties) were established, the study team developed several preliminary approaches to consolidation that were reviewed with MPRC and SPCD. At the conclusion of this initial phase of the comprehensive consolidation plan, three final options were reviewed and tested with regards to financial and phasing implications. Further study is required for a preferred option.

3. Program Comprehension

The Mayor's Office of Strategic Planning & Community Development (SPCD) developed a space program on which the consolidation options are based. The space program identified all of the various departments that are housed in either the ten buildings that are included in this study or in currently leased space. The program was developed by using the most recent research compiled in the 2004 *MPRC Report*. Additional departments were added to the comprehensive study, and department staff were interviewed to ascertain their square foot needs. The departments were then organized alphabetically as is shown on the City of Somerville website. The program spreadsheet (Table 1) follows.

The total gross area required for all the departments originally included in this comprehensive consolidation plan is 211,700 square feet. Table 1 also indicates which building the program is currently located in. As the study progressed it was deemed appropriate to exclude both the Public Safety Building and the Department of Public Works building from the consolidation options. Capital Projects Management, currently located at DPW, remains in the consolidation program because this program would relocate adjacent to the other Executive departments. When these Public Safety and DPW programs are removed, the total gross area of program need is reduced to 140,550 square feet.

A large component of the comprehensive program is affiliated with the School Department. The school administration is currently at the leased Boys & Girls Club building on Washington Street. The SCALE program for adult learning and the Community Schools offices are in leased space at the Tufts Administration Building on Holland Street. The Special Education administration is at Edgerly School along with the Next Wave/Full Circle programs. It is clear that the School Department offices and programs are dispersed throughout the city. Based on several discussions, further investigation is needed to determine if the Special Education administration should remain located as a single department or, if space allows, be dispersed to each of the school buildings they serve and thereby integrate the special education program more fully into each facility.

A recent change moved the Health Inspectors offices from City Hall Annex to the DPW where they are now adjacent to the Inspectional Services Department.

The departments were defined by whether they do or do not require public access in an effort to better understand the daily operations of the departments. Public access is defined as access by the general public, i.e. Somerville citizens, to an office or program space to obtain services. Of the original 211,700 GSF (gross square feet) program, 91,640 GSF of program require public access.

Table 1

No.	DEPARTMENT	Includes:	Current Location	GSF*
1	ASSESSING		City Hall	2,700
2	AUDITING		City Hall	1,920
3	BOARD OF ALDERMAN		City Hall	3,150
4	CITY CLERK		City Hall	3,080
5	COMMUNICATIONS	SCAT	City Hall SCAT Bldg.	1,600 4,500
6	ELECTIONS		City Hall	1,900
7	EXECUTIVE	Arts Council Capital Projects Management Constituent Services Council on Aging Senior Program Grants Administration Mayor Office of the GLBT Liason SomerStat	Annex DPW City Hall TAB 165 Broadway City Hall City Hall City Hall City Hall	1,800 920 1,000 9,600 3,460 300 2,300 300 1,100
8	HEALTH DEPARTMENT		Annex	2,250
9	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		City Hall	3,400
10	LAW OFFICE		City Hall	1,675
11	STRATEGIC PLANNING	Development Planning/Zoning (incl. Historic) Finance/Admin Infrastructure/Open Space Housing Programs & Services	City Hall City Hall City Hall City Hall Annex	5,000 incl. incl. incl. 2,200
12	PERSONNEL		City Hall	1,450
13	PURCHASING		City Hall	1,350
14	RECREATION & YOUTH	Community Youth Program Multi-purpose Space Recreation	165 Broadway 165 Broadway 19 Walnut St/Rec Bldg	3,460 4,000 8,000
15	SCHOOL DEPARTMENT	School Administration SCALE Next Wave & Full Circle SPED Parent Info Center Family Network Children's Partnership Food Services Technology Repair Community Schools	Boys & Girls Club 167 Holland Street/TAB Edgerly Edgerly Cummings School Cummings School Cummings School Winter Hill School Winter Hill School 167 Holland Street/TAB	8,200 10,000 11,900 8,000 7,500 incl. incl. 500 650 1,100
16	TRAFFIC & PARKING	Sign Shop/Meter Repair	133 Holland Street 133 Holland Street	5,205 1,795
17	TREASURER/COLLECTOR		City Hall	2,035
18	VETERAN'S SERVICES		Annex	1,250
19	STORAGE	City Archives	City Hall	10,000
			Total	140,550

* Source: The Office of Strategic Planning & Development
= requires public access

The chart below compares the needs (program square-foot of municipal departments) and the assets (the existing, city-owned and leased square feet). This indicates that the amount of assets (building square feet) is more than 2.5 times the area that is needed to house the required programs (365,682 GSF vs. 140,550 GSF). This asset total does not include the additional 30,550 SF of leased space at the Boys and Girls Club and the Tufts Administration Building, which increases the total assets to 396,232 GSF. This comparison highlights the excess space available and, in turn, the revenue opportunities from property disposition and elimination of leased space.

Table 2

PROGRAM (i.e. NEEDS)	GSF*	BUILDING (i.e. ASSETS)	GSF**
ASSESSING	2,700	Annex	18,216
AUDITING	1,920	Edgerly	81,000
BOARD OF ALDERMAN	3,150	Recreation	13,464
CITY CLERK	3,080	Homans	53,952
COMMUNICATIONS	1,600	Cummings	31,386
ELECTIONS	1,900	92 Union Square	9,000
EXECUTIVE	20,780	Powder House	100,653
HEALTH DEPARTMENT	2,250	City Hall	35,693
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	3,400	Traffic & Parking	11,368
LAW OFFICE	1,675	165 Broadway	10,950
STRATEGIC PLANNING	7,200		365,682
PERSONNEL	1,450		
PURCHASING	1,350	Leased Space:	
RECREATION & YOUTH	15,460	Boys & Girls Club	9,850
SCAT	4,500	TAB	20,700
SCHOOL DEPARTMENT	47,850		
TRAFFIC & PARKING	7,000		
TREASURER/COLLECTOR	2,035		
VETERAN'S SERVICES	1,250		
CITY ARCHIVES	10,000		
	140,550		396,232

* Source: Office of Strategic Planning & Development

** Source: Somerville Assessor's Office



4. Property Analysis

Description

The consolidation plan is focused on ten city-owned properties in Somerville. Each property was toured, existing documentation on the properties was reviewed, individuals who occupy the properties and DPW maintenance staff were consulted. Each task was undertaken to obtain a general knowledge of each property, its history, its current use, and its current condition. A brief description of each property follows:

City Hall Annex, 50 Evergreen Avenue

The Annex was constructed in 1962 as a nursing home. It is an 18,216 square-foot, three level building including a basement. It is currently used for municipal offices for Arts Council, Health Department, Housing Programs & Services, Veteran's Services, with various record storage at the lowest level. The building has an inefficient layout for its current use as offices due to the multiple toilet rooms. The following items need to be replaced due to age and/or deterioration: roof, windows, exterior steps and electrical distribution. The interior finishes are worn, the lighting is poor, the mechanical system requires upgrades and new toilet facilities are needed. The building is located on 0.36 acres in a residential neighborhood. The property has some parking and is near local bus routes.

In the future term, the Annex programs should be relocated to a more appropriate building and site and 50 Evergreen Avenue should be sold for residential development that would be appropriate in this residential neighborhood.

Edgerly School, 33 Cross Street

The Edgerly School was constructed in 1920 and has always served as a school building. It is an 81,000 square-foot, three level building. It is currently used by the school department for Special Education administration, Next Wave/Full Circle programs, and temporary school facilities for the Lincoln Park students until the new Argenziano School opens in September 2007. The following items need to be replaced due to age and/or deterioration: a portion of the roof, 2/3 of the windows, and exterior steps. The interior finishes are worn, the lighting is poor, the mechanical system requires upgrades and new toilet facilities are needed. The building is located on 1.01 acres in a residential neighborhood. The property has minimal parking and is near a local bus route.

In the future term, when renovated, either for municipal offices and programs or as residential units, the building will be a successful, pleasant space to either work or live. Edgerly's shortcomings lie in its site constraints; there is limited on-site parking possible and zoning will require that any change in use of this building will need to provide additional parking.

Recreation Building, 19 Walnut Street

The Recreation Building was constructed in 1900 as a district court house. It is a 13,464 square-foot, three level building including a basement. It is currently used by the Recreation Department for administrative offices, an art classroom plus support spaces, and a large multi-purpose room. The following items need to be replaced due to age and/or deterioration: roof, windows, exterior steps, and major masonry repair. The building is not accessible to the disabled at both the exterior and interior. The building requires all new electrical and mechanical systems, toilet facilities, and finishes. The building is located on 0.23 acres in a residential neighborhood. The property has minimal parking and is near a local bus route.

There is such extensive renovation work required at both the exterior and interior that the Rec Building has the highest per square foot renovation cost of all the buildings in this study. In addition to the high cost of renovation, the constrained site has only a few parking spaces and the interior configuration does not lend itself to an efficient layout for any other municipal program. In the future term, the Rec Building should be sold for renovation into distinctive residential units, a program type that would be appropriate in this dense residential neighborhood.

Homans Building, 350 Medford Street

The Homans Building was constructed in 1925 as a warehouse. The main building is a 53,952 square-foot, three level structure that is currently unused. There are three, single-story, garage-like structures adjoining the main building. DPW has minimal storage in one of the garages. Due to its intended use when constructed, the building has minimal lighting and heating, just enough to warehouse plumbing materials. The following items need to be replaced due to age and/or deterioration: roof, windows, and exterior masonry walls. The building is not accessible to the disabled at the exterior and the interior has only a freight elevator for accessible vertical circulation. The building requires all new electrical and mechanical systems, plumbing, toilet facilities, and finishes. The building is located on 1.11 acres in a commercial area at the other side of the train tracks from City Hall. The property has parking and is near local bus routes.

The building itself should be demolished rather than renovated. Due to the extensive renovation work that would be required for any reuse, the only component of the building that would be kept in a renovation is the structure, and even this would need to be supplemented to meet today's seismic code requirements. The Homans property is greater than an acre, centrally located, and adjacent to train tracks that in the future will accommodate the extension of the MBTA's Green Line. This city-owned property is valuable for its location, not its buildings. The site has great potential for future development.

Cummings School, 93 School Street

The original Cummings School was constructed in 1930 with an addition constructed in the 1960's and has always served as a school building. It is a 31,386 square-foot, multi-level building; portions of the building are one, two, and three stories. It is currently used by the school department as the Cummings School and the Parent Information Center. The Cummings students will attend the new Argenziano School beginning in September 2007. The following items need to be replaced due to age and/or deterioration: windows, lintels and exterior steps. The building is not accessible to the disabled both at the exterior and interior of the facility. The interior finishes are worn, the lighting is poor, and the mechanical and electrical systems require upgrades. The building is located on 1.04 acres in a residential neighborhood. The property has parking and is near a local bus route.

In the future term and once renovated, the Cummings School will be able to accommodate municipal programs successfully.

92 Union Square

92 Union Square was constructed as a fire station in 1900. It is a 9,000 square-foot, two level building. It is currently used by Somerville's Community Access Television (SCAT) at the first floor and Massachusetts Association of Portuguese Speakers at the second floor. The exterior of the building needs window replacement and minor roof repair and masonry repointing. The interior vertical circulation is not accessible. The interior finishes, lighting,

and the mechanical and electrical systems require upgrades. The building is located on 0.31 acres in a commercial square. The property does not have parking but is adjacent to public metered parking lot and is on local bus routes.

The building is located in the heart of Union Square, a vibrant area of the city that is expected to be an area of future development due to the intended MBTA Green Line extension. In the future term, this building will be sold for commercial development.

Powder House Community School, 1060 Broadway

Powder House Community School was constructed in 1973 and has always served as a school building. It is a 100,653 square-foot, multi-level building; portions are two and three stories. It is currently unoccupied. The exterior of the building needs window replacement and minor roof repair, masonry repointing, and exterior step repair. The main entrance is not accessible. The interior finishes are worn, the lighting is poor, the electrical system requires upgrades, the mechanical system needs to be replaced and the toilet facilities need to be upgraded. The building is located on 1.86 acres in a residential neighborhood in West Somerville. The property has parking and is near local bus routes.

In this study, it is the most valuable property if sold and the most costly property if renovated. A previous study assessed its potential for consolidation, and determined that the majority of the municipals programs could technically “fit”. However, any reuse plan presents significant challenges: its impact on the neighborhood and its high renovation costs. In the future term, PHCS greatest value to the city is to be sold for development.

City Hall, 93 Highland Avenue

City Hall was renovated in 1989. It was originally constructed as a school building in 1852. It is a 35,693 square foot, four level building. It is currently used for municipal offices such as the Mayor’s offices, Assessor, Auditing, City Clerk, Purchasing, and the Office of Strategic Planning & Development. The exterior of the building needs window replacement and minor flashing repair and masonry repointing. One of the building’s entrances is not accessible to the physically disabled. The interior finishes, lighting, electrical, and toilet facilities need upgrading. Minor water damage repair is needed in the Board of Alderman’s Chamber. The building is located on the same property with the Somerville High School and the Somerville Public Library. The property has parking and is on local bus routes.

City Hall is a distinctive civic building, centrally located “on the hill” in Somerville. While no major changes are contemplated, City Hall is included in this study to incorporate its municipal programs into the matrix and to assess the minor renovations that the facility needs.

Traffic & Parking, 133 Holland Street

The Traffic & Parking building was constructed in 1940 as a U.S. Post Office. It is an 11,368 square-foot, two-level building including a basement. The upper floor is used by the Traffic and Parking offices and the lower floor is used by the Meter and Sign Shop. The exterior of the building needs minor flashing repair and masonry repointing. The foundation/ basement walls require investigation into the cause of the significant water infiltration; repair and dampproofing may be required. The upper floor is accessible via a stair lift; the lower level is not accessible. The interior at the lower level needs moisture remediation, asbestos abatement and new lighting. The building is located on 0.23 acres in a residential neighborhood. The property has minimal parking and is on local bus routes.

The Traffic & Parking program can occur anywhere in the city where parking and public transportation are available. In the future term and in an effort to consolidate programs and eliminate inefficiencies, it is likely that this program will be incorporated into another city-owned property and this property would be sold.

165 Broadway

The building was constructed in 1900 as a fire station. It is a 10,950 square-foot, two level building. The lower floor is used by the East Somerville Senior Center and the upper floor is the Community Youth Program. The exterior of the building needs window replacement and minor roof repair and masonry repointing. The interior vertical circulation is not accessible. The interior finishes, lighting, and the mechanical and electrical systems require upgrades. The building is located on 0.21 acres in a commercial area. The property does not have parking and is on local bus routes.

In the intermediate term, a full renovation would improve its appearance, its character as a municipal property, its efficiency of space and use, and its accessibility. The current programs (senior center and youth center) serve the East Somerville community. It is foreseeable that these programs would remain at this location.

Photographs of each building follow.



CITY HALL ANNEX
50 Evergreen Avenue
YEAR BUILT: 1962

GSF: 18,216
LEVELS: 2 (plus basement)
LAND: 0.36 acres



HOMANS BUILDING
350 Medford Street
YEAR BUILT: 1925

GSF: 53,952 (main building)
LEVELS: 3
LAND: 1.11 acres



EDGERLY SCHOOL
33 Cross Street
YEAR BUILT: 1920

GSF: 81,000
LEVELS: 3
LAND: 1.01 acres



CUMMINGS SCHOOL
93 School Street
YEAR BUILT: 1930/1963

GSF: 31,386
LEVELS: multi-levels
LAND: 1.04 acres



RECREATION BUILDING
19 Walnut Street
YEAR BUILT: 1900

GSF: 13,464
LEVELS: 3
LAND: 0.23 acres



SCAT BUILDING
92 Union Square
YEAR BUILT: 1900

GSF: 9,000
LEVELS: 2
LAND: 0.31 acres

Municipal Property Comprehensive Consolidation Somerville, Massachusetts



**POWDER HOUSE
COMMUNITY SCHOOL**
1060 Broadway
YEAR BUILT: 1973

GSF: 100,653
LEVELS: 3/2
LAND: 1.86 acres



165 BROADWAY
YEAR BUILT: 1900

GSF: 10,950
LEVELS: 2
LAND: 0.21 acres



CITY HALL
93 Highland Avenue
YEAR BUILT: 1852/1989

GSF: 35,693
LEVELS: 4
LAND: XXX



DPW BUILDING
1 Franey Road
YEAR BUILT: 1900

GSF: 14,946
LEVELS: 3
LAND: 5.96 acres



**TRAFFIC & PARKING
BUILDING**
133 Holland Street
YEAR BUILT: 1940

GSF: 11,368
LEVELS: 2
LAND: 0.23 acres



PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING
228 Washington Street
YEAR BUILT: 1927/1985

GSF: 87,579
LEVELS: 3
LAND: 1.87 acres

Evaluation

As an initial method to highlight the buildings' existing conditions, the study team developed the following chart using a 0-3 ranking system of five areas of concern: accessibility, finishes, hazardous materials, mechanical/electrical/plumbing systems and structure. The totals column provides an initial sense of which properties are in the best physical condition (City Hall) versus those that require the most improvements (Homans Building).

One objective of this consolidation plan is to determine the highest and best use of city-owned properties. Within this context, the study team identified properties in terms of

Table 3
EXISTING CONDITIONS

PROPERTY	ACCESS	FINISHES	HAZMAT	SYSTEMS	STRUCT.	TOTALS
Annex	1	2	0	2	0	5
Edgerly	1	2	2	2	0	7
Recreation	3	3	2	3	0	11
Homans	3	3	3	3	3	15
Cummings	3	2	2	1	0	8
92 Union Square	2	1	1	0	0	4
Powder House	2	2	1	2	0	7
City Hall	0	2	0	0	0	2
Traffic & Parking	1	3	2	2	0	8
165 Broadway	3	3	1	2	0	9

KEY:

ACCESS = accessibility at entrance and interior

FINISHES = finishes at interior and exterior

HAZMAT = hazardous material abatement needed; observation only; does not include site

SYSTEMS = systems (MEP/FP) upgrade/replacement

STRUCTURAL = structural upgrades needed; observation only

0 = NONE

1 = MINIMUM

2 = MEDIUM

3 = MAXIMUM

their appropriateness. Appropriateness is defined as meeting the needs of the intended program in a facility that provides the necessary parking and access to public transportation, generates favorable neighborhood impact and fits the program needs well, in a building of suitable municipal character. The chart provides an assessment of each property relative to its appropriateness for its current use. Two buildings are currently unoccupied: Homans and Powder House Community School. The City Hall Annex, because it was constructed as a nursing home, does not have the appropriate character of a municipal office building.

Table 4

BUILDING APPROPRIATENESS for EXISTING USE

PROPERTY	CHARACT- ER	PARKING	PUBLIC TRANSP ¹	Neighb'd IMPACT	PROGRAM FIT
Annex	N	Y	Y	N	N
Edgerly	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Recreation	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Homans	-	-	-	-	-
Cummings	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
92 Union Square	Y	Y*	Y	Y	Y
Powder House	-	-	-	-	-
City Hall	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Traffic & Parking	N	Y**	Y	Y	Y
165 Broadway	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

* Public meter parking only

** On-street parking available

¹ Public transportation is within 1/4 mile/ 5 minute walk

Renovation Scope

Each of the properties has particular renovation needs in order to maintain and improve the existing conditions. To provide equality to the renovation scopes outlined, it is assumed that all buildings are to be renovated to a consistent level. Each building is to be renovated to operate as a municipal office building, inclusive of improvements to or new finishes, lighting, mechanical and electrical systems, and accessibility to all public areas. The renovations would meet the requirements of the Massachusetts State Building Code, Massachusetts Architectural Access Board (MAAB), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Renovation budget estimates for each property were developed to provide comparative costs of construction. The Homans Building scope and budget is for new construction.

The renovation scope and budget estimates for each property follow. The budget estimates are in 2006 construction dollars. Future escalation may be estimated at approximately 6%-8% per year. The budget estimates shown for exterior, interior and site work include the general contractor's mark up and profit. The soft costs include design services and fees, testing, permitting, etc. and are calculated at 20% of the construction cost, which is an industry standard. The project contingency is calculated at 25% of the combined construction and soft costs. The project contingency is intentionally high to allow for variations in scope and intentions for these projects. As a project progresses through the design phases and a more complete scope is determined, the project contingency would decrease.

Table 5.1

BUILDING	RENOVATIONS NEEDED	BUDGET ESTIMATE
Annex 1962 18,216 GSF (12,000) 2 plus basement level (former nursing home) current use - offices	EXTERIOR:	
	replace flat roof (t&g/rubber)	
	replace windows	
	replace concrete steps front and back	
	new accessible ramp	
	Exterior Subtotal:	\$185,000
	INTERIOR:	
	upgrade electrical	
	new central HVAC system	
	new toilet rooms	
	paint all surfaces	
	replace carpeting	
	replace ACT	
	new lighting	
	elevator upgrades	
	minor new partitions	
	Interior Subtotal:	\$700,000
	SITE:	
	upgrade 10-12 space parking lot (\$2000/space)	
	Site Subtotal:	\$34,000
Subtotal, incl. GC markup/profit		\$919,000
Soft costs		\$183,800
Project Contingency		\$275,700
Total		\$1,378,500

Table 5.2

BUILDING	RENOVATIONS NEEDED	BUDGET ESTIMATE
Edgerly	EXTERIOR:	
1920	replace 1/2 roof -flat (t&g/rubber)	
81,000 GSF	replace 2/3 windows (lintels, etc.)	
3 levels	minor masonry repointing	
	replace concrete steps (4 locations)	
	new accessible ramp	
current use - school	INTERIOR:	
	upgrade electrical	
	new central HVAC system	
	new toilet rooms	
	asbestos abatement at piping	
	refinish wood floors	
	paint all surfaces	
	replace ACT	
	new lighting	
	major new partitions	
	Exterior & Interior Subtotal:	\$6,500,000
	SITE:	
	upgrade 6-8 space parking lot	
	Site Subtotal:	<u>\$26,000</u>
	Subtotal, incl. GC markup/profit	\$6,526,000
	Soft costs	\$1,305,200
	Project Contingency	\$1,957,800
	Total	<u>\$9,789,000</u>

BUILDING	RENOVATIONS NEEDED	BUDGET ESTIMATE
Recreation	EXTERIOR:	
1900	replace roof -flat (t&g/rubber)	
13,464 GSF	replace windows (lintels, etc.)	
2 plus basement level	major stone & masonry repointing - historic façade	
	replace concrete steps	
	new accessible ramp	
(former district court)	INTERIOR:	
current use - offices/ recreation space	new electrical	
	new central HVAC system	
	new toilet rooms	
	asbestos abatement at piping	
	refinish wood floors	
	paint all surfaces	
	replace ACT	
	new lighting	
	new elevator	
	Exterior & Interior Subtotal:	\$1,800,000
	SITE:	
	upgrade 3-4 space parking lot	
	Site Subtotal:	<u>\$13,000</u>
	Subtotal, incl. GC markup/profit	\$1,813,000
	Soft costs	\$362,600
	Project Contingency	\$543,900
	Total	<u>\$2,719,500</u>

Table 5.4

BUILDING	RENOVATIONS NEEDED	BUDGET ESTIMATE
Homans 1925 53,589 GSF 3 levels (former warehouse) current use - not used	EXTERIOR:	
	new roof	
	new windows	
	new exterior walls	
	new accessible ramp	
	fully upgrade structure	
	demolitions 3 single story garage structures	
	INTERIOR:	
	new electrical	
	new central HVAC system	
	new plumbing	
	new passenger elevator, upgrade existing (2) service elevators	
	new 1st floor slab	
	new floors	
	all new interior partitions	
	new ceilings	
	new lighting	
	Exterior & Interior Subtotal:	NO RENOVATION, NEW CONSTRUCTION INSTEAD \$0
	SITE:	
	new site design (1.11 acres)	
	Site Subtotal:	\$500,000
	NEW CONSTRUCTION:	
	demolish all buildings, abatement etc.	\$300,000
	new office building (\$200/sf)x65,105 sf	\$13,021,000
	new office building (\$160/sf)x21,595 sf	\$3,455,200
	New Construction Subtotal:	<u>\$16,776,200</u>
Subtotal, incl. GC markup/profit		\$17,276,200
Soft costs		\$3,455,240
Project Contingency		\$5,182,860
Total		<u>\$25,914,300</u>

BUILDING

92 Union Square
1900
9,000 GSF
2 levels

(former fire station)
current use - offices/
tv studio

Table 5.6

BUILDING	RENOVATIONS NEEDED	BUDGET ESTIMATE
Cummings 1930/1960's 31,386 GSF multi-level current use - school	EXTERIOR:	
	minor roof repair	
	replace windows (lintels, etc.)	
	minor masonry repointing	
	repair concrete steps	
	new accessible ramp (2 locations)	
	INTERIOR:	
	upgrade electrical	
	new central HVAC system	
	asbestos abatement at piping/VAT	
	remove/abate unused oil tank	
	refinish wood floors	
	paint all surfaces	
	replace ACT	
	new lighting	
	major new partitions	
	new elevators (2)	
	Exterior & Interior Subtotal:	\$3,000,000
	SITE:	
	new 12-14 space parking lot at blacktop play area	
	Site Subtotal:	<u>\$38,000</u>
Subtotal, incl. GC markup/profit		\$3,038,000
Soft costs		\$607,600
Project Contingency		\$911,400
Total		<u>\$4,557,000</u>

BUILDING	RENOVATIONS NEEDED	BUDGET ESTIMATE
Powder House	EXTERIOR:	
1973	repair flat roof	
100, 653 GSF	replace windows (lintels, etc.)	
3/2 levels	minor masonry repointing	
	repair concrete steps	
(former school)	new accessible ramp	
current use - not used	INTERIOR:	
	upgrade electrical	
	new central HVAC system (replace electric system)	
	new toilet rooms	
	asbestos abatement at piping/VAT	
	new VCT flooring	
	paint all surfaces	
	replace ACT	
	new lighting	
	major new partitions (demo operable & cmu walls)	
	new elevator	
	seismic	
	Exterior & Interior Subtotal:	\$9,600,000
	SITE:	
	new 24-28 space parking lot at blacktop play area	
	Site Subtotal:	<u>\$76,000</u>
	Subtotal, incl. GC markup/profit	\$9,676,000
	Soft costs	\$1,935,200
	Project Contingency	\$2,902,800
	Total	<u>\$14,514,000</u>

Table 5.8

BUILDING	RENOVATIONS NEEDED	BUDGET ESTIMATE
City Hall 1852/1989 renov 35,693 GSF 4 levels (former City Hall) current use - City Hall	EXTERIOR:	
	minor flashing repair	
	minor masonry repointing	
	new accessible ramp	
	Exterior Subtotal:	\$75,000
	INTERIOR:	
	minor electrical upgrade	
	upgrade toilet rooms in part	
	refinish/repair terrazzo flooring	
	minor water damage repair	
	paint all surfaces	
	replace ACT in part	
	new lighting in part	
	minor new partitions 8000SF (? new attic space)	
	Interior Subtotal:	\$575,000
	SITE:	
	none	
	Site Subtotal:	<u>\$0</u>
Subtotal, incl. GC markup/profit		\$650,000
Soft costs		\$130,000
Project Contingency		\$195,000
Total		<u>\$975,000</u>
new central HVAC system (\$1.7M) - none		\$0
new windows		<u>\$350,000</u>
Subtotal, incl. GC markup/profit		\$350,000
Soft costs		\$70,000
Project Contingency		\$105,000
Sub Total		<u>\$525,000</u>
Total w/ new windows		\$1,500,000

Table 5.9

BUILDING	RENOVATIONS NEEDED	BUDGET ESTIMATE
Traffic & Parking 1940 11,368 GSF 2 levels (1 is a basement) (former post office) current use - offices of T&P	EXTERIOR:	
	minor roof/flashing repairs	
	minor masonry repointing	
	foundation/basement dampproofing	
	foundation/basement concrete repair	
	INTERIOR:	
	asbestos abatement VAT at basement	
	remediate moisture damage at basement	
	indoor air quality issues at basement	
	new concrete topping at basement floor	
	new lighting at basement	
	new elevator	
	Exterior & Interior Subtotal:	\$280,000
	SITE:	
	upgrade 6-8 space parking lot	
	Site Subtotal:	<u>\$26,000</u>
	Subtotal, incl. GC markup/profit	\$306,000
	Soft costs	\$61,200
	Project Contingency	<u>\$91,800</u>
	Total - basement level only	\$459,000
	Subtotal, repurpose upper floor (\$40/sf), incl. GC markup/profit	\$224,000
	Soft costs	\$44,800
	Project Contingency	<u>\$67,200</u>
	Sub Total	\$336,000
	Total - both floor levels	\$795,000

Table 5.10

BUILDING	RENOVATIONS NEEDED	BUDGET ESTIMATE
165 Broadway	EXTERIOR:	
1900	minor roof repair (original pitched slate roof)	
10,950 GSF	replace windows (lintels, etc.)	
2 levels	major masonry repointing/ cleaning	
(former fire station)	INTERIOR:	
current use - senior center/youth center	minor electrical upgrade	
	new HVAC system	
	asbestos abatement at piping	
	refinish wood floors	
	paint all surfaces	
	new ACT	
	new lighting	
	minor new partitions	
	new elevator	
	Exterior & Interior Subtotal:	\$1,200,000
	SITE:	
	none	
	Site Subtotal:	<u>\$0</u>
	Subtotal, incl. GC markup/profit	\$1,200,000
	Soft costs	\$240,000
	Project Contingency	\$360,000
	Total	<u>\$1,800,000</u>

In an effort to further compare and understand the level of renovation scope required at each of the properties, the property ranking developed during the initial evaluation compared to the renovation cost per square foot developed in the budget estimates. The information below shows that the budget estimates are in line with the initial assessment of each property. The only property out of sync is Traffic & Parking. This is for two reasons:

- It assumed no change in use, therefore the upper floor was not altered significantly. If the per square foot cost was calculated by only the lower level square footage (\$459,000/5,683 SF) than the cost per square foot would double to \$80.75.

Table 6

PROPERTY	BLDG GSF	LAND ACRES	Ranking ¹	RENOVATION COST ²	
				ESTIMATE	\$/GSF
City Hall	35,693		2	\$1,500,000	\$42.03 (no HVAC)
92 Union Square	9,000	0.31	4	\$945,000	\$105.00 (incl. change of use)
Annex	18,216	0.36	5	\$1,378,500	\$114.88 (upper floors only)
Edgerly	81,000	1.01	7	\$9,789,000	\$120.85
Powder House	100,653	1.86	7	\$14,514,000	\$144.20
Cummings	31,386	1.04	8	\$4,557,000	\$145.19
Traffic & Parking	11,368	0.23	8	\$459,000	\$40.38 (no change of use)
165 Broadway	10,950	0.21	9	\$1,800,000	\$164.38
Recreation	13,464	0.23	11	\$2,719,500	\$201.98
Homans	53,952	1.11	15	\$27,210,000	\$313.84 (new construction,
Total	365,682			\$64,872,000	86,700sf)

¹ Initial evaluation of existing building condition - reference Table 3 of this report

² All buildings are assumed to be renovated for municipal office/program use

Property Comparison

A final step prior to developing the preliminary options for municipal property consolidation was to compile the various values and cost implications for each property onto a single spreadsheet, labeled Table 7 on the following page. Each property is listed; the building gross square feet, the land acreage and the assessed values all came from the City of Somerville's Assessor's Database. The assessed values were recently updated in December 2006. The Office of Strategic Planning & Community Development (SPCD) worked with the City Assessor's office to develop the disposition values for each property, taking the following factors into consideration:

- Highest and best use: residential or commercial; rehabilitation of the existing building or new construction
- Zoning requirements
- Conservative parking requirements
- Conservative construction cost
- Recent comparable sales of school buildings in Somerville and Medford

The values are for comparative purposes only. Of the ten properties considered for the consolidation plan, the Powder House Community School has the highest disposition value. Second highest disposition value is for the Edgerly School. The lowest disposition value is for the 165 Broadway property. On a cost-per-square-foot disposition value, the SCAT Building in Union Square is by far the highest, nearly two times that of the next highest.

Utility costs for the most recent full year, 2006, are provided on the spreadsheet. City Hall has the highest per square foot utility cost; this is expected as City Hall is used both days and evenings in comparison to the 9-to-5 office use of the Annex. Powder House Community School's utility rate represents a little more than half a year when the building was partially occupied, while currently it is vacant. However, utility rates may vary for a number of reasons:

- Low efficiency of aging systems
- Minimally designed systems (i.e. window air conditioning units vs. central air conditioning systems)
- Single-pane windows and other uninsulated systems
- Spaces that are no longer used as originally intended (i.e. new interior partitions may hinder the building's system's efficiency)

The study team developed budget estimates for renovation costs. The scope for the renovations is outlined in this section of the report. The most costly property renovation is the Homans Building. The approximate \$27 million cost is for construction of a new 86,700 gross square foot municipal office building, inclusive of site development. There is an assumption that an additional 10,000 gross square feet will be developed by MBTA for a T station when the Green Line is extended along the tracks beside the Homan's property line. The 96,700 gross square feet total for new construction is the maximum that may be built on the property within zoning regulations.

Table 7
Property Comparison

PROPERTY	BLDG GSF	LAND ACRES	ASSESSED VALUE ¹		DISPOSITION VALUE ²		
			\$	\$/GSF	\$	**	\$/GSF
Annex	18,216	0.36	\$1,383,200	\$75.93	\$1,383,200	R	\$75.93
Edgerly	81,000	1.01	\$5,027,600	\$62.07	\$5,027,600	R	\$62.07
Recreation	13,464	0.23	\$912,700	\$67.79	\$934,643	R	\$69.42
Homans*	53,952	1.11	\$1,764,300	\$32.70	\$1,940,730	N	\$35.97
Cummings	31,386	1.04	\$2,305,700	\$73.46	\$2,305,000	R	\$73.44
92 Union Square	9,000	0.31	\$1,415,600	\$157.29	\$1,415,600	R	\$157.29
Powder House	100,653	1.86	\$7,190,300	\$71.44	\$7,190,300	N	\$71.44
City Hall	35,693			\$0.00	\$2,933,560	R	\$82.19
Traffic & Parking	11,368	0.23	\$966,100	\$84.98	\$966,100	N	\$84.98
165 Broadway	10,950	0.21	\$875,500	\$79.95	\$875,500	R	\$79.95
Total	365,682						

* Homans incurs \$180,000/year in note costs, therefore an additional \$3.33 per GSF.

** Assumes either new construction ("N") or rehab of existing building ("R")

¹ Source: Somerville Assessor's Office

² Source: The Office of Strategic Planning & Development

³ All buildings are assumed to be renovated for municipal office/program use

UTILITY COST ²		RENOVATION COST ³	
		BUDGET	
\$	\$/GSF	ESTIMATE	\$/GSF
\$12,932	\$0.71	\$1,378,500	\$114.88 (upper floors only)
\$76,894	\$0.95	\$9,789,000	\$120.85
\$16,598	\$1.23	\$2,719,500	\$201.98
\$7,075	\$0.13	\$27,210,000	\$313.84 (new construction, 86,700sf)
\$41,301	\$1.32	\$4,557,000	\$145.19
\$9,327	\$1.04	\$945,000	\$105.00 (incl. change of use)
\$179,001	\$1.78	\$14,514,000	\$144.20
\$83,083	\$2.33	\$1,500,000	\$42.03 (no HVAC)
\$19,404	\$1.71	\$459,000	\$40.38 (no change of use)
\$16,725	\$1.53	<u>\$1,800,000</u>	\$164.38
		\$64,872,000	

5. Preliminary Options

In the process of developing possible consolidation scenarios, five initial approaches were developed. A spreadsheet labeled Table 8 showing the five options follows this text. These initial approaches, explained in more detail below, were useful in two ways:

- By highlighting a single defining aspect
- By providing initial information to which the Committee was able to respond

Option 1 is based on the existing buildings' physical condition. Using our initial property evaluation chart, we selected the buildings that are in the best condition and that, when the square feet are totaled, provided enough to accommodate the consolidation program. The properties to remain in use are City Hall, City Hall Annex, Powder House Community School, and 92 Union Square. In Option 1 there is a surplus of 23,000 GSF of space that would allow for a small amount of future growth. The remaining surplus properties are to be sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of as determined by the city.

Option 2 represents the sale of the three properties with the highest initial market values developed by SPCD--these properties are Edgerly School, Powder House Community School, and Homans Building. In this option there is an approximate 10,500 GSF shortfall in the remaining space that is needed to accommodate the municipal programs.

Option 3 divided the consolidation program into two categories:

- Administrative services and departments, approximately 72,400 GSF
- Programs for seniors, youth, recreation, and school, approximately 68,200 GSF

This scenario suggests that all of the programs could be located within Edgerly School and the administrative services could be accommodated at City Hall, Cummings School and 92 Union Square.

Option 4 is titled "By Location" and is an entirely subjective scenario that assumes having centrally located, city-owned properties, as well as representative properties both in the West and East Somerville would provide a good distribution of municipal services and programs. The properties to remain in use in Option 4 are City Hall, Cummings School, 92 Union Square, 165 Broadway, and Powder House Community School. In Option 4 there is a surplus of 47,000 GSF of space that would allow for growth in the future. The remaining surplus properties are to be sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of as determined by the city.

Option 5 is titled "By Appropriateness" and is an entirely subjective scenario that assumes a property that is to serve the citizens of Somerville should provide an appropriate level of character befitting a municipal department or service. The properties selected for their solidity and stature are City Hall, Cummings School (especially the original building), Edgerly School, and 92 Union Square. In Option 5 there is a surplus of 16,500 GSF that would allow for a small amount of growth in the future. The remaining surplus properties are to be sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of as determined by the city.



Table 8
Consolidation Options

Existing Space		1 By Bldg Condition		2 By Market Value		3 By Admin/Serv. v. Programs		
Program Need	140,550	140,550		140,550		72,380	68,170	
Space Available	GSF	In use	Surplus	In use	Surplus	Admin/Serv	Programs	Surplus
Annex	18,216	18,216		18,216				18,216
Edgerly	81,000		81,000		81,000		81,000	
Recreation	13,464		13,464	13,464				13,464
Homans	53,952		53,952		53,952			53,952
Cummings	31,386		31,386	31,386		31,386		
92 Union Square	9,000	9,000		9,000		9,000		
Powder House	100,653	100,653			100,653			100,653
City Hall	35,693	35,693		35,693		35,693		
Traffic & Parking	11,368		11,368	11,368				11,368
165 Broadway	10,950		10,950	10,950				10,950
Total	365,682	163,562	202,120	130,077	235,605	76,079	81,000	208,603
Needed or (Surplus) Space	(225,132)	(23,012)		10,473		(3,699)	(12,830)	

Existing Space		4 By Location		5 By Appropriateness	
Program Need	140,550	140,550		140,550	
Space Available	GSF	In use	Surplus	In use	Surplus
Annex	18,216		18,216		18,216
Edgerly	81,000		81,000	81,000	
Recreation	13,464		13,464		13,464
Homans	53,952		53,952		53,952
Cummings	31,386	31,386		31,386	
92 Union Square	9,000	9,000		9,000	
Powder House	100,653	100,653			100,653
City Hall	35,693	35,693		35,693	
Traffic & Parking	11,368		11,368		11,368
165 Broadway	10,950	10,950			10,950
Total	365,682	187,682	178,000	157,079	208,603
Needed or (Surplus) Space	(225,132)	(47,132)		(16,529)	

Four additional consolidation scenarios were developed for review. Each option assumes a different building is to remain in use in addition to City Hall. The spreadsheet showing the four options follows this text.

- Option 1: Edgerly School remains
- Option 2: Cummings School remains
- Option 3: Powder House Community School remains
- Option 4: Private/Public Development

To achieve the required program area, each option proposes additional properties to remain in use. In Option 1, City Hall, Edgerly School and Cummings School, together provide nearly the total amount of required square footage to accommodate the consolidation program. In Option 2, City Hall and Cummings School remain and a to-be-determined (TBD) facility is needed to provide the required square footage to accommodate the consolidation program. In Option 3, City Hall, Powder House Community School, and Cummings School provide the required square feet for the program with a surplus of nearly 18,000 GSF for future expansion. Option 4 proposes that in addition to City Hall a new facility of approximately 115,000 GSF is needed to accommodate the consolidation program. Where this facility is located and how it is funded is to-be-determined.

In all four scenarios the remaining unused properties are considered surplus and may be sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of as determined by the city.

Table 9
Consolidation Options

Existing Space		1 EDGERLY OPTION		2 CUMMINGS OPTION	
Program Need	140,550	Program Need	140,550	Program Need	140,550
Space Available	GSF	Buildings In Use:	GSF	Buildings In Use:	GSF
Annex	18,216	City Hall	35,693	City Hall	35,693
Edgerly	81,000	Edgerly	81,000	Cummings	31,386
Recreation	13,464	Cummings	31,386	XXXXX - TBD	82,916
Homans	53,952				
Cummings	31,386				
92 Union Square	9,000	Total	148,079	Total	149,995
Powder House	100,653	Needed or (Surplus) Space	(7,529)	Needed or (Surplus) Space	(9,445)
City Hall	35,693	Surplus Buildings:		Surplus Buildings:	
Traffic & Parking	11,368	Annex	18,216	Annex	18,216
165 Broadway	10,950	Recreation	13,464	Recreation	13,464
Total	365,682	Homans	53,952	Homans	53,952
Needed or (Surplus) Space	(225,132)	92 Union Square	9,000	Edgerly	81,000
		Powder House	100,653	92 Union Square	9,000
		Traffic & Parking	11,368	Powder House	100,653
		165 Broadway	10,950	Traffic & Parking	11,368
				165 Broadway	10,950
		Total	217,603	Total	298,603

3 POWDER HOUSE OPTION

Program Need	140,550
Buildings In Use:	GSF
City Hall	35,693
Powder House	100,653
Cummings	31,386
Total	167,732

Needed or (Surplus) Space **(27,182)**

Surplus Buildings:

Annex	18,216
Recreation	13,464
Homans	53,952
92 Union Square	9,000
Edgerly	81,000
Traffic & Parking	11,368
165 Broadway	10,950
Total	197,950

4 PRIVATE/PUBLIC OPTION

Program Need	140,550
Buildings In Use:	GSF
City Hall	35,693
XXXXX - TBD	114,302
Total	149,995

Needed or (Surplus) Space **(9,445)**

Surplus Buildings:

Annex	18,216
Recreation	13,464
Homans	53,952
Cummings	31,386
92 Union Square	9,000
Edgerly	81,000
Powder House	100,653
Traffic & Parking	11,368
165 Broadway	10,950
Total	329,989

6. Options 1, 2 and 3

The three options use all the available information gathered during the consolidation study process. The following factors were taken into consideration to develop the options:

- Sale revenue
- Renovation costs
- Tax revenue
- Lease savings
- Utility savings
- Program fit
- Character of the property
- Parking and public transportation availability
- Neighborhood impact

The three options provide three ways for the city to look at consolidation of its municipal services. They are intended to give the city flexibility in the future as the assets and needs shift over time. Each option is developed by testing a specific hypothesis regarding municipal offices. The hypothesis tested for Option 1 is that municipal offices should be consolidated in city-owned buildings that are proximate to City Hall. The hypothesis tested for Option 2 is what occurs when the city sells the properties with the highest disposition value. And Option 3 tests the concept that consolidation in buildings that are not appropriate for office use is not the best use of city funding. Therefore in Option 3, in the immediate term, only minimal consolidation will occur allowing the city to sell some of its properties. In the future term, the city can revisit the concept of a larger-scale consolidation, possibly with a private development partner.

The phasing scenarios presented here are intended as examples of the phasing that might occur at a general level; it is clear that the actual phasing will be more complex and dynamic due to the variables associated with relocating departments and programs.

Option 1 enables the city to retain properties to centralize municipal services. The properties retained are:

- Homans property (new construction)
- Cummings School
- City Hall
- 165 Broadway

Homans, Cummings and City Hall are centrally located in the city and are an easy walk from one property to the next, albeit downhill in either direction from City Hall. The decision to keep 165 Broadway, a former fire station that houses both senior and youth programs, was made because the programs serve East Somerville neighborhood. This option assumes a complete build-out of the Homans property within current zoning requirements that allow 96,700 GSF. If 10,000 GSF were set aside for MBTA development once the Green T Line is extended, this would enable the city to construct an 86,700 GSF new building for municipal services. As a first pass at distributing the various programs the following is projected for each property:

Homans property (new building):

- City Hall Annex departments
- School Administration
- Special Education Administration (TBD)
- SCALE
- Council on Aging
- Recreation offices
- SCAT
- Traffic and Parking

Cummings School:

- Next Wave/Full Circle Programs (NWFC)
- Community Schools
- Parent Information Center (PIC)
- Recreation to use gymnasium and 1 classroom for art program

City Hall:

- Essentially the same programs, with potential for some shifting of programs to Homans property

165 Broadway:

- Senior Center
- Youth Center

Note: the “TBD” for the Special Education Administration refers to the need for further investigation into this possible distribution.

The preliminary phasing scenario for Option 1 is as follows:

1. **Sell** Powder House Community School (currently vacant)--immediate
2. Planning, design and construction of the Homans property--complete within 2 ½ years
3. Planning, design and phased renovation of 165 Broadway--complete within 1 ½ years
4. Students vacate Cummings School--July 2007
5. Lincoln Park students vacate Edgerly School--July 2007
6. PIC temporarily moves to Edgerly--September 2007
7. Cummings renovation--complete within 1 year
8. Next Wave/ Full Circle and SCALE move to Cummings--September 2008
9. Recreation offices to Annex, Recreation use at Cummings, **Sell** Recreation--September 2008
10. Special Education Administration distributed to schools (TBD)--by September 2008
11. **Sell** Edgerly School--September 2008
12. Homans property complete--June 2009, relocate programs to new building
13. **Eliminate** leases at Boys & Girls Club and TAB--June 2009
14. **Sell** 92 Union Square, City Hall Annex, Traffic & Parking

The worksheet, cost analysis summary, and appropriateness chart for Option 1 are on the following page. The cost analysis summary provides the sale and tax revenue gained and the new construction and/or renovation costs incurred for the option. Additionally, a summary shows if a property does (yes=Y) or does not (no=N) provide the level of appropriateness for its intended use within five categories: Character, Parking, Public Transportation, Neighborhood Impact and Program Fit. Option 1 has great potential of meeting each of these values for each of the municipal properties that is retained or, in the case of the Homans property; developed.

Option 1 Pros:

1. Retain centralized properties for municipal use
2. Consolidate programs onto a city-owned property (Homans)
3. Development of a new building/ property to meet city needs
4. Energize neighborhood
5. Future MBTA access at the Homans site

Option 1 Con:

1. Significant up-front capital costs in new construction and renovation,

Table10

OPTION 1: RETAIN PROPERTY TO CENTRALIZE MUNICIPAL SERVICES

Worksheet:

				DISPOSITION VALUE ¹			TAX REVENUE ¹	RENOVATION COST ²	
	PROPERTY	BLDG GSF	LAND ACRES	\$	**	\$/GSF	\$/YEAR	ESTIMATE	\$/GSF
Immediate Sales	Edgerly	81,000	1.01	\$5,027,600	R	\$62.07	\$86,872	\$9,789,000	\$120.85
	Powder House	100,653	1.86	\$7,190,300	N	\$71.44	\$110,761	\$14,514,000	\$144.20
	SubTotal			\$12,217,900			\$197,633	\$24,303,000	
Intermediate Renovations	Homans*	53,952	1.11	\$0	N	\$0.00	\$0	\$25,914,300	\$298.90
	Cummings	31,386	1.04	\$0	R	\$0.00	\$0	\$4,557,000	\$145.19
	City Hall	35,693		\$0	R	\$0.00	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$42.03
	165 Broadway	10,950	0.21	\$0	R	\$0.00	\$0	\$1,800,000	\$164.38
				\$0			\$0	\$33,771,300	
Future Sales	92 Union Square	9,000	0.31	\$1,415,600	R	\$157.29	\$18,936	\$945,000	\$105.00
	Annex	18,216	0.36	\$1,383,200	R	\$75.93	\$38,777	\$1,378,500	\$114.88
	Recreation	13,464	0.23	\$934,643	R	\$69.42	\$32,168	\$2,719,500	\$201.98
	Traffic & Parking	11,368	0.23	\$966,100	N	\$84.98	\$22,211	\$459,000	\$81.96
	SubTotal			\$4,699,543			\$112,092	\$5,502,000	
LEASED SPACE							SAVINGS/YR		
	Boys & Girls	9,850					\$181,634		
	TAB	20,700					\$264,331		
							\$445,965		

* Homans incurs \$180,000/year in note costs.

** Assumes either new construction ("N") or rehab of existing building ("R")

¹ Source: The Office of Strategic Planning & Development

² All buildings are assumed to be renovated or new construction for municipal office/program use

³ New construction at Homans includes 21,595 SF of unprogrammed, lease space.

Cost Analysis Summary:

Sale Revenue	Capital		Annual				
	New & Renovation Costs	Renovation Costs Averted	Annual Tax Revenue	Annual Lease Revenue	Annual Lease Savings	Annual Utility Savings	Annual Total
\$16,917,443	\$33,771,300	\$29,805,000	\$309,725	\$475,090	\$445,965	\$121,103	\$1,351,883

PROGRAM NOTES	UTILITY COST ¹			PROJECTED UTILITY COST	
	GSF	\$	\$/GSF	\$	\$/GSF
move NW/FC to Cummings; SpEd to Homans		\$76,894 \$179,001	\$0.95 \$1.78		
New bldg ³ ; 86,700 sf max + 10,000 sf MBTA	64,550	\$7,075	\$0.13	\$173,400	\$2.00
NW/FC, SCALE, recreation; move PIC to Homans	29,900	\$41,301	\$1.32	\$62,772	\$2.00
most programs remain + Capital Projects	35,180	\$83,083	\$2.33	\$83,165	\$2.33
senior & youth programs remain	10,920	\$16,725	\$1.53	\$21,900	\$2.00
move to Homans		\$9,327	\$1.04		
move to Homans		\$12,932	\$0.71		
move to Cummings		\$16,598	\$1.23		
move T&P offices to Homans, storage to DPW		\$19,404	\$1.71		
		<u>\$462,340</u>		<u>\$341,237</u>	
move to Homans					
move SCALE to Cummings; COA to Homans;					
Community Schools to Homans	<u>140,550</u>				

Appropriateness for Proposed Use:

Property	Character	Parking	Public Transport.	Neighb'd Impact	Program Fit
Homans	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cummings	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
City Hall	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
165 Broadway	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

Option 2 enables the city to divest the two properties that have both the highest disposition value and renovation costs: Homans Building and Powder House Community School.

The approximate revenue gained by selling the two properties is \$9.1 million. The potential renovation costs averted is \$40.4 million.

The Edgerly School, with 81,000 GSF, would be the largest building owned by the city. After renovation, the building would accommodate many of the municipal departments currently scattered throughout the city. The properties, when all renovations are complete, that will remain city-owned are:

- Edgerly School
- Cummings School
- City Hall
- 165 Broadway

The following program distribution is projected for each property:

Edgerly School:

- City Hall Annex departments
- School Administration
- Special Education Administration (TBD)
- SCALE
- Council on Aging
- Recreation offices
- SCAT
- Traffic and Parking

Cummings School:

- Next Wave/Full Circle Programs (NWFC)
- Community Schools
- Parent Information Center (PIC)
- Recreation to use gymnasium and 1 classroom for art program

City Hall:

- Essentially the same programs, with potential for some shifting of programs to Edgerly

165 Broadway:

- Senior Center
- Youth Center

Note: the “TBD” for the Special Education Administration refers to the need for further investigation into possible distribution.

The preliminary phasing scenario for Option 2 is as follows:

1. **Sell** Powder House Community School and Homans (currently vacant)—immediate
2. Planning, design and phased renovation of 165 Broadway—complete within 1 ½ years
3. Planning, design for renovations of Edgerly & Cummings—complete within 9 months

4. Students vacate Cummings School–July 2007
5. Lincoln Park students vacate Edgerly School–July 2007
6. PIC moves to Edgerly & Recreation move to Annex, **Sell** Recreation–September 2007
7. Cummings renovation–complete within 1 year
8. Next Wave/ Full Circle and SCALE move to Cummings–September 2008
9. Special Education Administration distributed to schools (TBD)–by September 2008
10. PIC move to TAB–September 2008
11. Edgerly renovation–complete within 1 year
12. Relocate programs to Edgerly–September 2009
13. **Eliminate** leases at Boys & Girls Club and TAB–September 2009
14. **Sell** 92 Union Square, City Hall Annex, Traffic & Parking

The worksheet, cost analysis summary, and appropriateness chart for Option 2 are on the following page. The cost analysis summary provides the sale and tax revenue gained and the new construction and/or renovation costs incurred for the option. Additionally, a summary shows if a property does (yes=Y) or does not (no=N) provide the level of appropriateness for its intended use within five categories: Character, Parking, Public Transportation, Neighborhood Impact and Program Fit. The summary for Option 2 indicates that the Edgerly School may fail as a good municipal program location for two important reasons: parking and neighborhood impact.

The Edgerly site is in a dense residential neighborhood with only on-street residential parking available. There is a limited parking area within the property that is at grade, and there is potential for parking at the ground floor level of the building. Previously car parking existed at this level. Even with these two potential locations, there is not nearly enough parking available to serve not only those that would work at the Edgerly building but also those that would need to visit the building during business hours. Option 2 would require possible land acquisition or some other alternative to provide parking for the facility.

The parking concern stated above is one of the reasons that this option may have a negative neighborhood impact. Even if the parking concerns are solved, the sheer volume of visitors to a municipal building with many varied uses will have a noticeable impact on the neighborhood.

Option 2 Pros:

1. Immediate sale revenue of approximately \$9 million (while averting renovation costs of approximately \$40 million)
2. Consolidate programs into an already city-owned property (Edgerly)

Option 2 Cons:

1. Residential neighborhood impact, both for parking and high volume of visitors

Table 11

OPTION 2: DIVEST PROPERTY WITH THE HIGHEST DISPOSITION VALUE

Worksheet:

				DISPOSITION VALUE ¹			TAX REVENUE ¹	RENOVATION COST ²	
PROPERTY		BLDG GSF	LAND ACRES	\$	**	\$/GSF	\$/YEAR	ESTIMATE	\$/GSF
Immediate Sales	Homans*	53,952	1.11	\$1,940,730	N	\$35.97	\$33,812	\$25,914,300	\$298.90
	Powder House	100,653	1.86	\$7,190,300	N	\$71.44	\$110,761	\$14,514,000	\$144.20
	SubTotal			<u>\$9,131,030</u>			<u>\$144,573</u>	<u>\$40,428,300</u>	
Intermediate Renovations	Edgerly	81,000	1.01	\$0	R	\$0.00	\$0	\$9,789,000	\$120.85
	Cummings	31,386	1.04	\$0	R	\$0.00	\$0	\$4,557,000	\$145.19
	City Hall	35,693		\$0	R	\$0.00	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$42.03
	165 Broadway	10,950	0.21	<u>\$0</u>	R	<u>\$0.00</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$1,800,000</u>	<u>\$164.38</u>
				\$0			\$0	\$17,646,000	
Future Sales	92 Union Square	9,000	0.31	\$1,415,600	R	\$157.29	\$18,936	\$945,000	\$105.00
	Annex	18,216	0.36	\$1,383,200	R	\$75.93	\$38,777	\$1,378,500	\$114.88
	Recreation	13,464	0.23	\$934,643	R	\$69.42	\$32,168	\$2,719,500	\$201.98
	Traffic & Parking	11,368	0.23	<u>\$966,100</u>	N	<u>\$84.98</u>	<u>\$22,211</u>	<u>\$459,000</u>	<u>\$81.96</u>
	SubTotal			<u>\$4,699,543</u>			<u>\$112,092</u>	<u>\$5,502,000</u>	
LEASED SPACE							SAVINGS/YR		
Boys & Girls		9,850					\$181,634		
TAB		20,700					<u>\$264,331</u>		
							\$445,965		
Homans Note							\$180,000		

* Homans incurs \$180,000/year in note costs

** Assumes either new construction ("N") or rehab of existing building ("R")

¹ Source: The Office of Strategic Planning & Development

² All buildings are assumed to be renovated or new construction for municipal office/program use

Cost Analysis Summary:

Capital			Annual				
Sale Revenue	Renovation Costs	New/Renov Costs Averted	Annual Tax Revenue	Annual Lease Revenue	Annual Lease Savings	Annual Utility Savings	Annual Total
\$13,830,573	\$17,646,000	\$45,930,300	\$256,665	\$0	\$625,965	\$155,293	\$1,037,923

AND RENOVATION COSTS

PROGRAM NOTES	UTILITY COST ¹			PROJECTED UTILITY COST	
	GSF	\$	\$/GSF	\$	\$/GSF
New bldg ³ ; 86,700 sf max		\$7,075	\$0.13		
		\$179,001	\$1.78		
move NW/FC to Cummings; parking at 1st floor	64,550	\$76,894	\$0.95	\$129,100	\$2.00
NW/FC, SCALE, recreation; move PIC to Edgerly	29,900	\$41,301	\$1.32	\$62,772	\$2.00
most programs remain + Capital Projects	35,180	\$83,083	\$2.33	\$83,165	\$2.33
senior & youth programs remain	10,920	\$16,725	\$1.53	\$21,900	\$2.00
move to Edgerly		\$9,327	\$1.04		
move to Edgerly		\$12,932	\$0.71		
move to Cummings		\$16,598	\$1.23		
move T&P offices to Edgerly, storage to DPW		\$19,404	\$1.71		
		<u>\$462,340</u>		<u>\$296,937</u>	
move to Edgerly					
move SCALE to Cummings; COA to Edgerly;					
Community Schools to Edgerly	<u>140,550</u>				

Appropriateness for Proposed Use:

Property	Character	Parking	Public Transport.	Neighb'd Impact	Program Fit
Edgerly	Y	TBD	Y	TBD	Y
Cummings	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
City Hall	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
165 Broadway	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

Option 3 enables the city to rid itself of under performing, inefficiently used, surplus properties, while centralizing some services and retaining other properties to allow for flexible future consolidation. At present, this option retains the leased spaces, in lieu of consolidation in a property not particularly well suited for municipal office use. The properties retained are:

- City Hall
- Cummings School
- 165 Broadway
- New Construction of approximately 85,000 GSF (Homans site, Union Square or TBD)

Cummings School and City Hall are centrally located in the city and it is an easy walk between the two properties. Additionally, the Homans property and locations in Union Square are proximate to City Hall and Cummings. Retaining 165 Broadway allows the current programs, both for seniors and youth, to continue to serve the East Somerville neighborhood.

This option assumes that at a future date there is a new building constructed, either on the Homan's site, in Union Square or elsewhere, likely through a public-private partnership. The city could potentially enter into a ground-lease agreement with a private developer to retain control of municipally owned assets while generating a continuous income stream and leveraging private investment in the city. In general terms, a ground lease usually covers a period of time from 50 to 99 years with a fixed initial term and a value review mechanism with an appraisal method that ensures negotiation between the two parties. This type of partnership could include the private construction of a facility in which the city would be an anchor tenant.

A complete build-out of the Homans property within current zoning requirements would allow 96,700 GSF. If 10,000 GSF were set aside for MBTA development once the Green T Line is extended, this would enable the city to construct an 86,700 GSF new building for municipal services. Assuming a building of approximately this size is constructed at the Homans site, in Union Square, or elsewhere, a preliminary distribution of the various programs for each property is as follows:

New construction (Homans, Union Square, TBD):

- City Hall Annex departments
- School Administration
- Community Schools
- Council on Aging
- Recreation offices
- SCALE
- SCAT
- Traffic and Parking

Cummings School:

- Next Wave/Full Circle Programs (NWFC)
- Special Education Administration (TBD)
- Parent Information Center (PIC)

City Hall:

- Essentially the same programs, with potential for some shifting of programs to new construction

165 Broadway:

- Senior Center
- Youth Center

Note: the “TBD” for the Special Education Administration refers to the need for further investigation into possible distribution.

The preliminary phasing scenario for Option 3 is as follows:

1. **Sell** Powder House Community School (currently vacant)–immediate
2. Recreation offices to Annex (Retirement Offices), Recreation use at Cummings/Edgerly, **Sell** Recreation–immediate
3. Planning & design for renovations of 165 Broadway & Cummings – complete within 1 year
4. **Sell** 92 Union Square as part of Union Square Prospectus – within 1 year
5. All Students vacate Cummings School–July 2007
6. Lincoln Park students vacate Edgerly School–July 2007
7. Next Wave/ Full Circle and SPED move to Cummings–September 2008
8. **Sell** Edgerly School when vacated –September 2008
9. Planning, design and construction of New Building (Homans, Union Sq, TBD)–complete within 2 ½ years
10. New property complete–June 2009, relocate programs to new building
11. **Eliminate** leases at Boys & Girls Club and TAB–June 2009
12. **Sell** City Hall Annex and Traffic & Parking

The worksheet, cost analysis summary, and appropriateness chart for Option 3 are on the following page. The cost analysis summary provides the sale and tax revenue gained and the new construction and/or renovation costs incurred for the option. Additionally, a summary shows if a property does (yes=Y) or does not (no=N) provide the level of appropriateness for its intended use within five categories: Character, Parking, Public Transportation, Neighborhood Impact and Program Fit. Option 3 has great potential of meeting each of these values for each of the municipal properties that is retained or, in the case of the Homans or other property; developed.

Option 3 Pros:

1. Sale of under-performing city-owned properties
2. Consolidate programs either at Homans property, in Union Square or other location in the future term
3. Development of a new building/ property to meet city needs

Option 3 Con:

1. Does not allow for significant consolidation in the immediate term

Table 12

OPTION 3: CONSERVATIVE CONSOLIDATION WITH FUTURE FLEXIBILITY

Worksheet:

				DISPOSITION VALUE ¹			TAX REVENUE ¹	RENOVATION COST ²	
	PROPERTY	BLDG GSF	LAND ACRES	\$	**	\$/GSF	\$/YEAR	ESTIMATE	\$/GSF
Immediate Sales	Powder House	100,653	1.86	\$7,190,300	N	\$71.44	\$110,761	\$14,514,000	\$144.20
	Recreation	13,464	0.23	\$934,643	R	\$69.42	\$32,168	\$2,719,500	\$201.98
	SubTotal			\$8,124,943			\$142,929	\$17,233,500	
Intermediate Renovations	Homans*/Union Sq/TBD	53,952	1.11	\$0	N	\$0.00	\$0	\$25,914,300 ⁴	\$298.90
	Cummings	31,386	1.04	\$0	R	\$0.00	\$0	\$4,557,000	\$145.19
	City Hall	35,693		\$0	R	\$0.00	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$42.03
	165 Broadway	10,950	0.21	\$0	R	\$0.00	\$0	\$1,800,000	\$164.38
				\$0			\$0	\$33,771,300	
Future Sales	92 Union Square	9,000	0.31	\$1,415,600	R	\$157.29	\$18,936	\$945,000	\$105.00
	Edgerly	81,000	1.01	\$5,027,600	R	\$62.07	\$86,872	\$9,789,000	\$120.85
	Annex	18,216	0.36	\$1,383,200	R	\$75.93	\$38,777	\$1,378,500	\$114.88
	Traffic & Parking	11,368	0.23	\$966,100	N	\$84.98	\$22,211	\$459,000	\$81.96
	SubTotal			\$8,792,500			\$166,796	\$12,571,500	
LEASED SPACE							SAVINGS/YR		
	Boys & Girls	9,850					\$181,634		
	TAB	20,700					\$264,331		
							\$445,965		

* Homans incurs \$180,000/year in note costs

** Assumes either new construction ("N") or rehab of existing building ("R")

¹ Source: The Office of Strategic Planning & Development² All buildings are assumed to be renovated or new construction for municipal office/program use³ New construction at Homans/Union Sq./TBD site includes 21,595 SF of unprogrammed, lease space.⁴ A significant portion of this construction/renovation cost would be shared/absorbed by a private partner.**Cost Analysis Summary:**

Sale Revenue	Capital		Annual				
	Renovation Costs	New/Renov Costs Averted	Annual Tax Revenue	Annual Lease Revenue	Annual Lease Savings	Annual Utility Savings	Annual Total
\$16,917,443	\$33,771,300	\$29,805,000	\$309,725	\$0	\$445,965	\$155,293	\$910,983

PROGRAM NOTES	UTILITY COST ¹			PROJECTED UTILITY COST	
	GSF	\$	\$/GSF	\$	\$/GSF
move rec offices to Annex, rec programs at Cummings		\$179,001 \$16,598	\$1.78 \$1.23		
New bldg ³ ; 86,700 sf max + 10,000 sf MBTA	64,550	\$7,075	\$0.13	\$129,100	\$2.00
NW/FC, SPED, PIC	29,900	\$41,301	\$1.32	\$62,772	\$2.00
most programs remain + Capital Projects	35,180	\$83,083	\$2.33	\$83,165	\$2.33
senior & youth programs remain	10,920	\$16,725	\$1.53	\$21,900	\$2.00
move to New bldg ³		\$9,327	\$1.04		
move NW/FC & SPED to Cummings		\$76,894	\$0.95		
move to New bldg ³		\$12,932	\$0.71		
move T&P offices to New bldg ³ , storage to DPW		\$19,404	\$1.71		
		<u>\$462,340</u>		<u>\$296,937</u>	
move to New bldg ³					
move SCALE, COA, Community Schools to New bldg ³	<u>140,550</u>				

Appropriateness for Proposed Use:

Property	Character	Parking	Public Transport.	Neighb'd Impact	Program Fit
Cummings	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
City Hall	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
165 Broadway	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Homans ¹	TBD	Y	Y	Y	TBD

¹ New construction at Homans, Union Square, or TBD

7. Conclusion

The City of Somerville is in the enviable position of having more property and building square feet than needed to accommodate the municipal programs that are part of this consolidation plan. However, this situation also presents significant challenges:

- The costs of maintaining and operating excess real estate
- Functional inefficiency of dispersed programs
- Inability to offer convenient access and one-stop services to constituents

Additionally, because the average age of the ten properties studied in this report is 85 years, with four properties greater than 100 years and all but one greater than 45 years in age, the ability of the facilities to serve the program needs of today is strained. Based on the property assessment completed during this study, it is our recommendation that any consolidation scenario pursued by the City assumes that the Annex and the Recreation Building are sold for more appropriate uses.

The options developed in this initial phase of the consolidation plan provide a starting point for further development and fulfill the following three objectives:

- Consolidation to centralize municipal services
- Consolidate to divest the property(ies) with the highest disposition value and highest renovation costs
- Consolidate conservatively at present, to provide flexibility for the city's future growth

The options that are described in Section 6 of this report are rational and achievable and result in the highest and best use of the city-owned properties, improve customer access and service, eliminate excess building stock and provide a plan for upgrading others. The options provide the initial strategy for long range planning through a step-by-step disposition of excess property to offset the costs of consolidation.

